

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)  
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)  
Chief, Criminal Division

TAREK J. HELOU (CABN 218225)  
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7071  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234  
Tarek.J.Helou@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

LUIGI FULVIO PALMARES AGUILAR,

Defendant.

CR No. 08-434 SI

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER  
EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3161

On July 3, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for the defendant's arraignment. At that time, the parties requested, and the Court agreed, to exclude all time under the Speedy Trial Act between July 3, 2008 and August 15, 2008 because defense counsel needs time to review electronic discovery, and also because the attorneys representing both parties are unavailable until that date. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for preparation of defense counsel and continuity of defense counsel

**FILED**  
JUL 07 2008  
RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 and government counsel. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of  
2 justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the  
3 defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

4  
5 SO STIPULATED:

6  
7 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
United States Attorney

8  
9 DATED: July 3, 2008

/s/  
10 TAREK J. HELOU  
Assistant United States Attorney

11  
12 DATED: July 3, 2008

/s/  
13 GEOFFREY HANSEN  
Attorney for Defendant Margaret Pek Hoon Lim

14  
15 For the reasons stated above, the Court finds that exclusion of time from July 3, 2008  
16 through August 15, 2008 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance  
17 outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §3161  
18 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny both parties continuity of  
19 counsel, and deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel, and would result in a  
20 miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

21  
22 SO ORDERED.

23  
24 DATED: 7-7-08

  
25 THE HONORABLE MARIA-ELENA JAMES  
United States Magistrate Judge